

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed July 27, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice. Further, the specification has been amended for better conformance to U.S. practice.

By means of the present amendment, claims 2-7, 9-12 and 14 have been amended for non-statutory reasons. Claims 2-7, 9-12 and 14 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 2-3, 6 and 14 for certain informalities. In response, claims 2-3, 6 and 14 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to 2-3, 6 and 14 is

respectfully requested.

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1 and 13-14 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-13 of U.S. Patent No. 5,938,606. The Examiner indicated that a terminal disclaimer may be used to overcome this rejection. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 11-13 of U.S. Patent No. 5,938,606 have been thoroughly reviewed, and it is respectfully submitted that claims 11-13 do not teach or suggest any "viewing means for visualizing the images together with together with parameters that include the distensibility as a ratio of dilation by a diameter of the artery," as recited in amended independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 13. Accordingly withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,938,606 (Bonnefous-606). Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bonnefous-606 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,508,768 (Hall). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bonnefous-606 in view

of U.S. Patent No. 5,579,771 (Bonnefous-771). Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bonnefous-771 in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0031921 (Bonnefous-921). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bonnefous-771 in view of Hall. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 and 9-17 are patentable over Bonnefous-606, Hall, Bonnefous-771 and Bonnefous-921 for at least the following reasons.

On page 7 of the Office Action, in rejecting claim 8, the Examiner correctly noted that Bonnefous-606 does not teach or suggest calculating the distensibility as a ratio of the dilation by a diameter of the artery. Column 5, line 51, column 6, line 30 of Bonnefous-771 are cited in an attempt to remedy this deficiency in Bonnefous-606.

It is respectfully submitted that the noted sections of Bonnefous-771 are completely silent and do not teach or suggest "viewing means for visualizing the images together with together with parameters that include the distensibility being a ratio of dilation by a diameter of the artery," (emphasis added) as recited in amended independent claim 1, and similarly recited in

independent claims 13 and 15. Rather, the noted sections of Bonnefous-771 disclose parameters such as dilation, diameter, pressure, velocity, distance and area.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, 13 and 15 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-7, 9-12, 14 and 16-17 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 15 as well as their individually patentable elements.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
October 22, 2007

Enclosure: New Abstract

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101